respectfully say, is very odd, no responsible Government can respond to this kind of thing.

SHRI DINKARRAO GOVINDRAO PATIL: In the context of the U.S. stand being in favour of Pakistan, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the justification for providing the nuclear weapons and also providing the airborne warning and control system advanced by the USA, is the Soviet presence in Afghanistan a patently bogus pretext, coming at a time when the USSR is committed to withdraw from there and when General Zia of Pakistan has himsef gone on record as having said that the Soviets do not pose any threat to his nation's security?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you understood anything? Then you can say something. Yes, Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, I do not want to embarrass the Minister. But may I say, Sir, that there is no smoke without fire, Pakistan has actively engaged in producing atomic weapons. I think this country should assume that. Some time back, you are aware, you were a Minister of Defence also, the United States played a havoc with us in respect of the supply of Uranium to Tarapur plant, even though the Government of the USA had been committed to us for its supply. Now, Sir, this has gone from that position to another extremity of giving up commitment on non-proliferation, at least in respect of Pakistan. And now it is aiding, helping Pakistan in its programme to produce potentially dangerous atomic weapons in the near future. It is being helped by China also. Sir, this creates a grave security situation as my friend has already stated. I do not want him to commit himself on the floor of the House because I understand his predicament, the security climate is already changed in this sub-Continent. I want to know whether the Government would take all steps to see that the programme of Pakistan is properly met by a counter programme here? It has got a significance in what I say. Would he assure the Members of the House? You are equally concerned with the security of the country. So, will he assure us that for the security of the country no stone will be left unturned? Will he take all measures for protecting the security of the country?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: It is my privilege to give that assurance to the hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh

*102. SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court at Chandigarh had not been functioning for over a year on account of the presiding Officer's post lying vacant;

(b) if so, what steps have been taken to mitigate the hardship caused thereby to the labour force particularly when an officer appointed as Presiding, Officer over five months back has yet to assume charge; and

(c) what was the number of cases pending in the said Court as on the 1st January and 1st October, 1986?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI P.A. SANGMA): (a) and (b) No, Sir. The post of Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribuanl-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh, remained vacant from 16-4-1986 to 20-10-1986.

(c) On 1 January, 1986, 60 cases were pending while on 1 October, 1986, 86 cases were pending. The number of applications pending on these two dates were 531 and 577 respectively.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: We all desire expeditious disposal of all the judicial matters, particularly in the case of labour matters, and in this particular case, the non-functioning of the court for a long period has caused a lot of injustice to the labour force and also unrest amongst them. I would request the hon. Minister to share with us as to what were the reasons for not appointing Presiding Officer, particularly when there is only one officer who presides over and there is no other member to constitute the court or the Tribunal as such.

SHRI P.A. SANGMA: I fully share the concern of the hon. Member for the delay in disposal of the cases. But sometimes we find ourselves in a difficult position in spite of our best efforts.

As far as the appointment of the Presiding Officer is concerned, the qualification laid down in the Industrial Disputes Act under Section 7, 7(a) and 7(b) is... except for the retired judge of a High Court all the qualified persons are under the control of the respective Hon'ble High Courts and, therefore, we have to go through the Hon'ble High Court for recruitment of this officer.

As far as the Chandigarh case is concerned, I would like to share my experience with the House. It may take a little more time than usual. As I said, the post remained vacant from 16-4-1986 to 20-10-1986. We knew that the post was going to be vacant on 16-4-1986 and, therefore, we had processed the case much in advance and, in fact, I approved the appointment of a new Presiding Officer on 21-3-1986, at least 16 days before the retirement of the incumbent at that time, and the ACC approved it on 3-4-1986 and we intimated to the High Court on 13-4-1986. So, one Mr. Gulati was appointed. But the High Court wrote back to us saying that there is a gentleman called Mr. I. P. Vashist who was earlier occupying that office and they wrote to us: "You appoint him rather than Mr. Gulati". So, we processed the case and I approved the appointment on 18-6-1986; ACC approved it on 26-6-1986. On the 2nd of July 1986, the High Court again wrote back to us saying that this man is not willing. "Why don't you take Mr. Gulati whom you had approved earlier?" I said, O.K., there is no problem. Then on 19-7-1986, the High Court wrote to us again saying. "No we are sorry, Mr. Gulati is not available; he is not willing to join this post. So, we are recommending you a new name, the name of Mr. M.K. Bansal." I do not know whether he has anything to do with Mr. P.K. Bansal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is why he has put the question.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It is just a coincidence.

SHRI P.A. SANGMA: As soon as we received the third name from the High Court. I approved the name without hesitation on 1-8-86. The ACC approved the name on 10-9-1986. The man is in position from 21-10-86. This is the problem that I had to face.

MR. CHAIRMAN: After this exhaustive answer, I do not think, you have another supplementary.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Even the new presiding officer has not started functioning in the real sense. Now, my second supplementary relates to the fact that in addition to the number of cases which have been pointed out as pending before the tribunal, over 1,000 cases are pending with the Union Territory Administration for reference under section 10(1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what steps are being taken to ensure that the cases do not remain

pending with the appropriate Government, particularly, the Central Government, for reference?

SHRI P.A. SANGMA: Sir, I had applied my mind. In fact, a month ago, I have been going into all these figures. The figures are really fantastic. Mr. Bansal has referred to the Centralsector and the State sector. I must share with the House the figures. The number of cases pending in the State sector all over the country is 1,80,038. In the case of the Central sphere, the number of cases pending is 5, 072. Now , we have enacted some laws. In fact, the Industrial Disputes Act was amended to see that individual cases or petitions are disposed of within a time-frame of three months. This law was amended quite sometime back. But the fact remains that things did not improve.

As far as the Central Government cases are concerned. we have only 10 labour industrial tribunals-cum-courts all over the country. It is not possible for these labour courts to attend to all the cases all over the country. Under section 36 of the Industrial Disputes Act, the Central Government can designate any of the State industrial tribunals-cum-courts to be a Central Government court also. I wrote to the Chief Ministers ten days back asking them to indicate the number of courts which can be spared for us. Now, as you are aware, even in their own sphere, there are a large number of cases pending with them and, therefore, it will not be possible for them to attend to our cases also. Therefore, I have offered to the Chief Ministers that we would give any financial assistance, if required, from the Central Government may be to appoint new Benches or new presiding officers or even to create new courts. It is easier for them I have said, financial assistance will be given, if required. I am awaiting the response from them.

*103. *[The questioners (Shri Basudev Mohapatra and Shri Muralidhar Chandrakant Bhandare) were absent. For answers, vide cols. 34-35 infra].*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 104. Shri Kalpnath Rai. Not here. Shri Gurupadaswamy.

Acceptance of the recommendations made by the Fourth Pay Commission

*104. SHRI KALPNATH RAI:
SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:†

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have accepted the recommendations made by the Fourth Commission;

(b) if so, whether any improvements were made on the recommendations made by the Commission;

(c) what is the additional burden that will fall on the exchequer in a year in implementing the recommendations; and

(d) whether Government have taken steps to curb possible price rise in respect of different commodities and services in the wake of the new pay scales guranted to the Central Government employees?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. K. GADHVI). (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) and (b) The Government have accepted broadly, subject to certain improvements, the recommen-

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.